

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

SHARON BAILEY,

Appellant,

v.

COLUMBIA BASIN COLLEGE,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-01-0020

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated June 5, 2001. The hearing was held in the Administration Building of the Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

**Appearances.** Appellant Sharon Bailey was present and was represented by Leslie Liddle, Employee Relations Specialist for the Washington Public Employees Association. Ruben Lemos, Associate Dean of Human Resources, represented Respondent Columbia Basin College.

**Background.** Appellant submitted a Position Questionnaire (PQ) requesting that her position as a Library Technician III be reallocated to the class of Library Supervisor II. On January 4, 2001, Ruben Lemos conducted a position audit. Mr. Lemos concluded that Appellant's position was correctly allocated to the class of Library Technician III. By letter dated January 8, 2001, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On March 29, 2001,

1 Joanel Huart, Human Resource Consultant, conducted a telephone interview and by letter dated  
2 June 5, 2001, informed Appellant that her position should be reallocated to the Library Technician  
3 Lead classification. On July 2, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the  
4 Department of Personnel.

5  
6 Appellant works at the circulation desk at Columbia Basin College Library. Appellant supervises  
7 six to eight student workers, maintains print and non-print periodicals and other serial subscriptions  
8 and performs circulation services.

9  
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant takes exception to the director's determination  
11 that she does not perform the level of complex technical work necessary to allocate her to the  
12 Library Supervisor II classification. Appellant contends that the very nature of the various library  
13 systems and the contents of the collections she works with require complex technical knowledge  
14 which is not routine in nature. Appellant asserts that she works independently to determine work  
15 priorities and deadlines and only consults with the library administrator when necessary. Appellant  
16 contends that she functions as a library supervisor because she has the sole discretion to interview,  
17 recommend, and train student workers. Appellant contends that she schedules the work shifts for  
18 students workers, arranges for work coverage in their absence, provides them with evaluations at  
19 the end of the semester and takes/recommends disciplinary action, including termination, when  
20 necessary.

21  
22 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent asserts that although Appellant interviews,  
23 hires, evaluates and disciplines employees, she does not have authority to approve payment of their  
24 salaries. Respondent asserts that the work Appellant performs is technical, but is routine in nature  
25 rather than complex and intensive as required by the Library Supervisor classifications.  
26 Respondent argues that Appellant handles routine student complaints and provides basic

1 information to students on database and computer use. Respondent argues that Appellant has no  
2 budget authority. Respondent argues that Appellant's position is appropriately allocated to the  
3 Library Technician Lead.

4  
5 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
6 to the Library Technician Lead classification should be affirmed.

7  
8 **Relevant Classifications.** Library Technician, class code 4328; Library Supervisor I, class code  
9 4320; Library Supervisor II, class code 4321.

10  
11 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
12 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
13 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
14 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
15 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
16 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
17 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
18 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

19  
20 The Basic Function of a position allocated to the Library Technician Lead is to "[l]ead assigned  
21 staff and perform complex library technical tasks in support of the overall library function." An  
22 employee with lead responsibilities regularly assigns, instructs and checks the work of others.  
23 However, the director's designee agrees that Appellant's responsibilities over student workers goes  
24 beyond lead work and are supervisory in nature. Therefore, there is no dispute that Appellant has  
25 the authority to interview, hire, train, evaluate and terminate student workers whose combined work  
26 hours exceed one FTE. Because Appellant's duties go beyond that of a lead worker, the Library

1 Technician Lead classification does not best describe the overall duties and responsibilities of her  
2 position.

3  
4 The Basic Function of a Library Supervisor I is to “[s]upervise assigned personnel and maintain the  
5 operations of a library unit or function.” The Distinguishing Characteristics of the Library  
6 Supervisor I include the following:

7 With delegated authority, interview and recommend selection of applicant,  
8 conduct training, assign and schedule work, act upon leave requests, conduct  
9 annual performance evaluations, and recommend disciplinary action.

10 Under general direction and within established guidelines, maintain the operations  
11 of a library unit or function.

12 Perform complex library work and problem solving using intensive application of  
13 knowledge and skills such as interpret automated and/or manual records, resolve  
14 client complaints, monitor unit budgets, and recommend changes in library unit or  
15 function procedures.

16 The director’s designee concluded that Appellant both supervised personnel and maintained the  
17 operations of the circulation unit functions. The question here is whether Appellant performs  
18 complex library work and problem solving using intensive application of her knowledge and skills.  
19 The director’s designee concluded that Appellant’s duties did not involve complex technical library  
20 work or problem solving using intensive application of knowledge and skills. We disagree that the  
21 majority of the duties Appellant performs at the circulation desk are basic and general in nature.  
22 While Appellant may perform a number of duties which can be described as routine technical  
23 library tasks, she also performs duties which require her to use an intensive application of her  
24 knowledge and skills related to the circulation desk functions. It is undisputed that Appellant’s  
25 duties require that she ensure compliance with organizational rules and procedures, assist in writing  
26 procedures for the circulation desk, collect fines and help resolve any discrepancies found, interpret  
automated records, and check in serials, process claims and update journal changes. Appellant’s

1 overall responsibilities and duties are clearly encompassed by the typical work of the Library  
2 Supervisor I and this classification best describes Appellant's position.

3  
4 The Basic Function of the Library Supervisor II class specification indicates the position is  
5 responsible for supervising assigned personnel and assigning and directing the operations of a large  
6 library unit, or one or more units, characterized by staff performing a variety of complex technical  
7 work or multiple functions. The record here does not support that Appellant directs the operation of  
8 a large library unit, one or more units, or that the staff she supervises perform a variety of complex  
9 technical work multiple functions. Therefore, Appellant's position does not fit the overall duties  
10 and responsibilities necessary to be classified to the Library Supervisor II classification.

11  
12 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal should be granted in part, and her position should be reallocated to  
13 the Library Supervisor I classification.

14  
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Sharon Bailey is granted in  
17 part, the Director's determination is reversed, and Appellant's position is reallocated to the class of  
18 Library Supervisor I.

19  
20 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

21 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504